

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 13–15, 23–29, 43, 44, 54–56, 58, 65, and 67 are pending in this application. Non-elected claims 54–56, 58, 65, and 67 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 13, 24, 27, 28, and 43 are amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in Examples 48-56 and Table 7 of Applicants' specification. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 13–15, 23–29, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0106697 to Lortz et al. ("Lortz"), and rejects claims 1, 2, 13–15, and 23–29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,235,260 to Toki et al. ("Toki"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The rejections set forth in the Office Action are predicated upon the Examiner's claim construction that "does not negate addition of base, acid, and dispersion stabilizer to the dispersoid after it is made," and that the amounts of water recited in the claims are "not considered to limit a final dispersoid composition." By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended to specify that (1) no other water is added to the dispersoid than the amounts recited in the claims, and (2) no acid, no base, and no dispersion stabilizer is added to the dispersoid. Because the limitations were not previously considered by the Examiner, the rejections as set forth in the Office Action are moot. And, for at least the reasons previously made of record, Applicants submit that neither of the applied references teaches or

otherwise would have rendered obvious dispersions having these limitations and/or a transmittance as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jeffrey R. Bousquet
Registration No. 57,771

JAO:JRB

Date: November 3, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
